

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B5

Date: **JAN 03 2012**

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a software development and consulting company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a Project Manager. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's April 15, 2008 denial, the issue in this case is whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), states in pertinent part that:

(2) Aliens Who Are Members of the Professions Holding Advanced Degrees or Aliens of Exceptional Ability. --

(A) In General. -- Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

Successor in Interest

As a threshold matter, the AAO will consider whether the petition is accompanied by a labor certification valid for the proffered position due to the discontinuation of activity by the petitioning corporation in 2008. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 (l)(3)(i); 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (c)(2); and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(c). Counsel claims that the original petitioner has been succeeded by [REDACTED] on or about May 1, 2008 based on the purported purchase of the original petitioner's stock and that this new owner is entitled to use both the petition and labor certification to employ the beneficiary.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has not issued regulations governing immigrant visa petitions filed by a successor-in-interest employer. Instead, such matters are

adjudicated in accordance with *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm'r 1981) ("*Matter of Dial Auto*") a binding, legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) decision that was designated as a precedent by the Commissioner in 1986. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions are binding on all immigration officers in the administration of the Act.

The facts of the precedent decision, *Matter of Dial Auto*, are instructive in this matter. *Matter of Dial Auto* involved a petition filed by Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc. (Dial Auto) on behalf of an alien beneficiary for the position of automotive technician. The beneficiary's former employer, Elvira Auto Body, filed the underlying labor certification. On the petition, Dial Auto claimed to be a successor-in-interest to Elvira Auto Body. The part of the Commissioner's decision relating to the successor-in-interest issue follows:

Additionally, the representations made by the petitioner concerning the relationship between Elvira Auto Body and itself are issues which have not been resolved. In order to determine whether the petitioner was a true successor to Elvira Auto Body, counsel was instructed on appeal to fully explain the manner by which the petitioner took over the business of Elvira Auto Body and to provide the Service with a copy of the contract or agreement between the two entities; however, no response was submitted. If the *petitioner's claim of having assumed all of Elvira Auto Body's rights, duties, obligations, etc.*, is found to be untrue, then grounds would exist for invalidation of the labor certification under 20 C.F.R. § 656.30 (1987). Conversely, if the claim is found to be true, and it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved if eligibility is otherwise shown, including ability of the predecessor enterprise to have paid the certified wage at the time of filing.

19 I&N Dec. at 482-3 (emphasis added).

In *Matter of Dial Auto*, the petitioner specifically represented that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations, but failed to submit requested evidence to establish that this claim was, in fact, true. The Commissioner stated that if the petitioner's claim was untrue, the INS could invalidate the underlying labor certification for fraud or willful misrepresentation. For this reason the Commissioner said: "if the claim is found to be true, *and* it is determined that an actual successorship exists, the petition could be approved" *Id.* (emphasis added).

The Commissioner clearly considered the petitioner's claim that it had assumed all of the original employer's rights, duties, and obligations to be a separate inquiry from whether or not the petitioner is a successor-in-interest. The Commissioner was most interested in receiving a full explanation as to the "manner by which the petitioner took over the business" and seeing a copy of "the contract or agreement between the two entities" in order to verify the petitioner's claims. *Id.*

Accordingly, *Matter of Dial Auto* does not stand for the proposition that a valid successor

relationship may only be established through the assumption of “all” or a totality of a predecessor entity’s rights, duties, and obligations. Instead, the generally accepted definition of a successor-in-interest is broader: “One who follows another in ownership or control of property. A successor in interest retains the same rights as the original owner, with no change in substance.” *Black’s Law Dictionary* 1570 (9th ed. 2009) (defining “successor in interest”).

With respect to corporations, a successor is generally created when one corporation is vested with the rights and obligations of an earlier corporation through amalgamation, consolidation, or other assumption of interests.¹ *Id.* at 1569 (defining “successor”). When considering other business organizations, such as partnerships or sole proprietorships, even a partial change in ownership may require the petitioner to establish that it is a true successor-in-interest to the employer identified in the labor certification application.²

The merger or consolidation of a business organization into another will give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship because the assets and obligations are transferred by operation of law. However, a mere transfer of assets, even one that takes up a predecessor’s business activities, does not necessarily create a successor-in-interest. *See Holland v. Williams Mountain Coal Co.*, 496 F.3d 670, 672 (D.C. Cir. 2007). An asset transaction occurs when one business organization sells property – such as real estate, machinery, or intellectual property – to another business organization. The purchase of assets from a predecessor will only result in a successor-in-interest relationship if the parties agree to the transfer and assumption of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business.³ *See generally* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170

¹ Merger and acquisition transactions, in which the interests of two or more corporations become unified, may be arranged into four general groups. The first group includes “consolidations” that occur when two or more corporations are united to create one new corporation. The second group includes “mergers,” consisting of a transaction in which one of the constituent companies remains in being, absorbing the other constituent corporation. The third type of combination includes “reorganizations” that occur when the new corporation is the reincarnation or reorganization of one previously existing. The fourth group includes transactions in which a corporation, although continuing to exist as a “shell” legal entity, is in fact merged into another through the acquisition of its assets and business operations. 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2165 (2010).

² For example, unlike a corporation with its own distinct legal identity, if a general partnership adds a partner after the filing of a labor certification application, a Form I-140 filed by what is essentially a new partnership must contain evidence that this partnership is a successor-in-interest to the filer of the labor certification application. *See Matter of United Investment Group*, 19 I&N Dec. 248 (Comm’r 1984). Similarly, if the employer identified in a labor certification application is a sole proprietorship, and the petitioner identified in the Form I-140 is a business organization, such as a corporation which happens to be solely owned by the individual who filed the labor certification application, the petitioner must nevertheless establish that it is a bona fide successor-in-interest.

³ The mere assumption of immigration obligations, or the transfer of immigration benefits derived

(2010). In the instant case, it is unclear whether the alleged successorship concerns the transfer of assets from one corporation to another.

Considering *Matter of Dial Auto* and the generally accepted definition of successor-in-interest, a petitioner may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three conditions. First, the petitioning successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part of, the beneficiary's predecessor employer. Second, the petitioning successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered on the labor certification. Third, the petitioning successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased assets from the predecessor, but also the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. To ensure that the job opportunity remains the same as originally certified, the successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, in the same metropolitan statistical area and the essential business functions must remain substantially the same as before the ownership transfer. *See Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

In order to establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects, the petitioner must support its claim with all necessary evidence, including evidence of ability to pay. The petitioning successor must prove the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and until the date of transfer of ownership to the successor. In addition, the petitioner must establish the successor's ability to pay the proffered wage in accordance from the date of transfer of ownership forward. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2); *see also Matter of Dial Auto*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

Applying the analysis set forth above to the instant petition, the petitioner has not established a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes. The petitioner submits a "Memorandum" which describes the acquisition of [REDACTED] in very general terms. The evidence in the record does not establish the organizational structure of the predecessor prior to the transfer, or the current organizational structure of the successor. The evidence does not establish that the petitioner acquired the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner as the predecessor. In fact, the "Memorandum" makes no mention of the transfer of essential business obligations at all. The buyer appears to be a mere transferee of some assets or, perhaps, the sole stockholder of the petitioner. Buying the stock of a predecessor does not establish a successor-in-interest relationship. Stockholders and corporations are considered legally separate persons. *See, e.g., Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm'r 1980). The evidence does not establish that the successor is continuing to operate the same type of business as the predecessor. The evidence does not establish that the manner in which the business is controlled

from approved or pending immigration petitions or applications, will not give rise to a successor-in-interest relationship unless the transfer results from the bona fide acquisition of the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business in the same manner. *See* 19 Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 2170; *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 656.12(a).

by the successor is substantially the same as it was before the ownership transfer.

Therefore, the evidence in the record is not sufficient to establish that [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed for this additional reason. The labor certification is no longer valid for the job opportunity. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Nevertheless, the AAO will consider whether the petitioner has established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage and will assume the establishment of a successor-in-interest relationship.

Ability to Pay the Proffered Wage

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

Ability of prospective employer to pay wage. Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its ETA Form 9089 as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted on January 11, 2007. The proffered wage as stated on the ETA Form 9089 is \$43.16 per hour (\$89,772.80 per year).

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d at 145. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.⁴

⁴ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

The evidence in the record of proceeding shows that the petitioner and the alleged successor are structured as C corporations. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1997, to have a gross annual income of \$3,129,981, and to currently employ 50 workers. According to the tax returns in the record, the petitioner's fiscal year is based on a calendar year. On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on May 20, 2007, the beneficiary did not claim to have worked for the petitioner.⁵

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of an ETA Form 9089 establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the ETA Form 9089, the petitioner must establish that the job offer was realistic as of the priority date and that the offer remained realistic for each year thereafter, until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is an essential element in evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, USCIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The beneficiary's Forms W-2 for 2008 through 2010 show compensation received from the petitioner as detailed in the table below.

Year	Beneficiary's actual Compensation	Proffered wage	Wage increase needed to pay proffered wage
2010	\$98,995 ⁶	\$89,772.80	\$0
2009	\$89,610	\$89,772.80	\$162.80
2008	\$27,360	\$89,772.80	\$62,412
2007	\$0	\$89,772.80	\$89,772.80

The alleged successor has established that it paid the beneficiary the proffered wage in 2010 and less than the full proffered wage from 2008 and 2009. The petitioner did not pay the beneficiary any wages in 2007. Therefore, USCIS will review net income and net current assets from 2007 through 2009.

⁵ Counsel states that the beneficiary began working with the petitioner towards the end of 2008.

⁶ The beneficiary's compensation in 2008, 2009, and 2010 was paid by the alleged successor-in-interest, [REDACTED]

If, as in this case, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during the required period, USCIS will next examine the net income figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010). Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (citing *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984)); see also *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983). Reliance on the petitioner's gross receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. The court specifically rejected the argument that USCIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. See *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

On appeal, counsel states that depreciation should be added back to the petitioner's taxable income. With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not represent current use of cash, neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.

We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 118. "[USCIS] and judicial precedent support the use of tax returns and the net income figures in determining petitioner's ability to pay. Plaintiffs' argument that these figures

should be revised by the court by adding back depreciation is without support.” *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The petitioner’s 2007 federal income tax return was the most recent return available. In response to the AAO’s request for evidence, the alleged successor submitted its 2008 through 2010 tax returns which will be considered in this decision.

The alleged successor’s and the petitioner’s tax returns show net income as detailed in the table below.

Year	Net Income
2009	\$93,177 (Alleged successor)
2008	-\$411,436 (Alleged successor)
2007	\$63,446 (Petitioner)

The alleged successor has established that it had sufficient net income to pay the proffered wage for 2009, but did not in 2008. The petitioner has not established that it had sufficient net income to pay the full proffered wage for 2007. It is noted that the record is devoid of evidence of the petitioner’s ability to pay from January 1, 2008 until the date of its alleged acquisition on May 1, 2008. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm’r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg’l Comm’r 1972)). Therefore, USCIS will review the petitioner’s net current assets for those years.

Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner’s current assets and current liabilities.⁷ A corporation’s year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation’s end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the petitioner is expected to be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets.

The petitioner’s tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets as shown in the following table.

⁷ According to *Barron’s Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), “current assets” consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. “Current liabilities” are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

Year	Net Current Assets
2008	-\$2,431,729
2007	\$155,897

The alleged successor's net current assets were insufficient to pay the proffered wage in 2008.

On appeal, counsel submits the bank statements to show the ability to pay the proffered wage for 2007 and 2008. However, counsel's reliance on the balance in the petitioner's bank account is misplaced. First, bank statements are not among the three types of evidence, enumerated in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2), required to illustrate a petitioner's ability to pay a proffered wage. While this regulation allows additional material "in appropriate cases," the petitioner in this case has not demonstrated why the documentation specified at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) is inapplicable or otherwise paints an inaccurate financial picture of the petitioner or alleged successor. Second, bank statements show the amount in an account on a given date, and cannot show the sustainable ability to pay a proffered wage. Third, no evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the funds reported on the bank statements somehow reflect additional available funds that were not reflected on the tax return(s), such as taxable income (income minus deductions) or the cash specified on Schedule L that was considered above in determining the corporations' net current assets.

Counsel advised that the beneficiary will replace temporary workers. The record does not, however, name these workers, state their wages, verify their full-time employment, or provide evidence that the petitioner has replaced or will replace them with the beneficiary. In general, wages already paid to others are not available to prove the ability to pay the wage proffered to the beneficiary at the priority date of the petition and continuing to the present. Moreover, there is no evidence that the position involves the same duties as those set forth in the ETA Form 9089. The petitioner has not documented the position, duty, and termination of the worker who performed the duties of the proffered position. If that employee performed other kinds of work, then the beneficiary could not have replaced him or her.

Since the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets, USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. See *Matter of Sonogawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612.

The petitioning entity in *Sonogawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about \$100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the

lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere.

As in *Sonegawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The AAO recognizes that the original petitioner had been in business since 1997. Nevertheless, the evidence submitted does not reflect a pattern of significant growth or the occurrence of an uncharacteristic business expenditure or loss that would explain its alleged successor's inability to pay the proffered wage in 2008. In addition, no evidence has been presented to show that the entity has a sound and outstanding business reputation as in *Sonegawa*. Unlike *Sonegawa*, the petitioner has not submitted any evidence reflecting the alleged successor's reputation or historical growth since its inception. Nor has it included any evidence or detailed explanation of the corporation's milestone achievements. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the alleged successor has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The evidence in the record does not establish that [REDACTED] is a successor-in-interest to [REDACTED]. Additionally, the evidence submitted does not establish that the alleged successor had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage. The petition will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial.

When the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it is shown that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.